

REMARKS

Claims 10-18 and 34-41 are all the claims pending in the application. By this Amendment, claims 19-33 and 42-49 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Nonstatutory Double Patenting

Claims 10-18 and 34-41 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of double patenting over claims 17-25 and 48-55 of US 6,680,975 (“the ‘975 patent”). Claims 11-14 and 16-18 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of double patenting over claims 57-60 and 62-64 of copending Application No. 10/609,438 (“the ‘438 application”). Claims 34-37 and 39-41 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of double patenting over claims 80-83 and 85-87 of the ‘438 application.

Statutory Double Patenting

Claims 11-14 and 16-18 are provisionally rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claims 17-20 and 22-24 of the ‘438 application. Claims 34-37 and 39-41 are provisionally rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claims 40-43 and 45-47 of the ‘438 application.

Applicant submits the following in traversal of the claim rejections.

Rejection of Claims 10-18 and 34-41 Under The Judicially Created Doctrine Of Double Patenting Over Claims 17-25 and 48-55 the ‘975 Patent

These rejections are respectfully traversed. Applicant believes that claim 10 is not an obvious variant of the invention defined by claim 17 of the ‘975 patent. Claim 10 recites:

A decoder for decompressing a compressed video signal, the compressed video signal containing entropy encoded data representing a set of video spatial frequency coefficients of an individual sub-block which have been scanned using a selected one of a plurality of different scanning patterns to produce a set of reordered coefficients *arranged based on the selected one of the plurality of different scanning patterns and the set of reordered coefficients having been transformed into a symbol state to generate the entropy encoded data . . .*

In contrast, Applicant believes that claim 17 of the '975 patent does not teach or suggest, *inter alia*, a set of reordered coefficients arranged based on the selected one of the plurality of different scanning patterns and the set of reordered coefficients having been transformed into a symbol state to generate the entropy encoded data.

Similarly, claim 11 is believed to be patentable because claim 11 recites a decoder comprising, *inter alia*:

an entropy decoder to which is applied the compressed video signal, the compressed video signal including entropy encoded data representing a set of video spatial frequency coefficients of an individual sub-block which have been scanned using a specific pattern selected from a plurality of different scanning patterns, *wherein the specific pattern selected from the plurality of different scanning patterns produces a most efficient coding according to a predetermined criterion*, to produce a set of reordered coefficients *arranged based on the specific pattern selected from the plurality of different scanning patterns and the set of reordered coefficients having been transformed into a symbol state to generate the entropy encoded data*, said entropy decoder being operative to entropy decode the entropy encoded data and to output entropy decoded data.

It is believed that claim 18 of the '975 patent does not teach or suggest a set of reordered coefficients arranged based on the specific pattern selected from the plurality of different

Amendment Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U.S. Patent Appl'n. No.: 10/612,013

scanning patterns and the set of reordered coefficients having been transformed into a symbol state to generate the entropy encoded data, in combination with other elements of the claim.

Claims 12-18, which depend from claim 11, are believed to be patentable for at least the reasons submitted for claim 11.

Claim 34 is believed to be patentable for reasons similar to those submitted for claim 10. Claims 35-41, which depend from claim 34, are patentable for at least the reasons submitted for claim 34.

Provisional Rejection of Claims 11-14 and 16-18 Under The Judicially Created Doctrine
Of Double Patenting Over Claims 57-60 and 62-64 of the '438 Application

Provisional Rejection of Claims 34-37 and 39-41 Under The Judicially Created Doctrine
Of Double Patenting Over Claims 80-83 and 85-87 of the '438 Application

Provisional Rejection of Claims 11-14 and 16-18 Under 35 U.S.C. § 101 As Claiming
The Same Invention As That Of Claims 17-20 and 22-24 of the '438 Application

Provisional Rejection of Claims 34-37 and 39-41 Under 35 U.S.C. § 101 As Claiming
The Same Invention As That Of Claims 40-43 and 45-47 of the '438 Application

Applicant requests the Examiner to hold the above rejections of the claims over the '438 Application in abeyance.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Amendment Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U.S. Patent Appl'n. No.: 10/612,013

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Seok-Won Stuart Lee
Limited Recognition No. L0212

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: June 16, 2005